

REVIEWED BY J. L. Smith DATE FEB 2 9 1984RDS ☐ or XDS ☐ EXT. DATE 39

TS AUTH. _____ REASON(S) _____

ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐DECLASSIFIED ☐ RELEASAB ☐RELEASE DENIED ☐

PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS _____ UNITED STATES MISSION

TO THE UNITED NATIONS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASEPress Release No. 4070
October 23, 1962

Statement by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, United States Representative to the United Nations, in the Security Council, on Cuba.

I have asked for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to bring to your attention a grave threat to the Western Hemisphere and to the peace of the world.

Last night, the President of the United States reported the recent alarming military developments in Cuba. Permit me to remind you of the President's sobering words:

"Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere. Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning at 9 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And having now confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in full detail.

"The characteristics of these new missile sites indicate two distinct types of installations. Several of them include medium range ballistic missiles, capable of carrying a nuclear warhead for a distance of more than 1,000 nautical miles. Each of these missiles, in short, is capable of striking Washington, D.C., the Panama Canal, Cape Canaveral, Mexico City, or any other city in the Southeastern part of the United States, in Central America or in the Caribbean area.

"Additional sites not yet completed appear to be designed for intermediate range ballistic missiles -- capable of travelling more than twice as far -- and thus capable of striking most of the major cities in the Western Hemisphere, ranging as far north as Hudson's Bay, Canada, and as far south as Lima, Peru. In addition, jet bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, are now being uncased and assembled in Cuba, while the necessary air bases are being prepared."

In view of this transformation of Cuba into a base for offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction, the President announced the initiation of a strict quarantine on all offensive military weapons under shipment to Cuba. He did so because, in the view of my Government, the recent developments in Cuba -- the importation of the cold war into the heart of the Americas --

They announced their common determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ... to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights ... to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." And in one sentence, Paragraph 4, Article 2, they defined the necessary condition of a community of independent peoples:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

In this spirit, these fifty-one nations solemnly resolved to band together in a great cooperative quest for world peace and world progress. The adventure of the United Nations held out to humanity the bright hope of a new world -- a world securely founded in international peace, in national independence, in personal freedom, in respect for law, for social justice and betterment, and, in the words of the Charter, for "equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

The vision of San Francisco was the vision of a world community of independent nations, each freely developing according to its own traditions and its own genius, bound together by a common respect for the rights of other nations and by a common loyalty to the larger international order. This vision assumes that this earth is quite large enough to shelter a great variety of economic systems, political creeds, philosophical beliefs and religious convictions. The faith of the Charter is in a pluralistic world, a world of free choice, respecting the infinite diversity of mankind and dedicated to nations living together as good neighbors, in peace.

Like many peoples, we welcomed the world of the Charter, for our society is based on principles of choice and consent.

We believe the principles of an open society in the world order survive and flourish in the competitions of peace. We believe that freedom and diversity are the best climate for human creativity and social progress. We reject all fatalistic philosophies of history and all theories of political and social predestination. We doubt whether any nation has so absolute a grip on absolute truth that it is entitled to impose its idea of what is right on others. And we know that a world community of independent nations accepting a common frame of international order offers the best safeguard for the safety of our shores and the security of our people. Our commitment to the world of the Charter expresses both our deepest philosophical traditions and the most realistic interpretation of our national interest.

III.

Had we any other vision of the world, had we sought the path of empire, our opportunities for self-aggrandizement immediately after the war were ^{almost} unparalleled. In 1945, we were incomparably the greatest military power in the world. Our troops and planes were dispersed at strategic points around the globe. We had exclusive possession of the terror and promise of atomic energy. Our economic strength was unmatched. If the American purpose had been world dominion, there could have been no more propitious moment to set out on such a course.

Instead, our commitment, then as now, was to the world of the Charter -- the creation of a community of freely cooperating independent states bound together by the United Nations. In the service of this commitment, and without waiting for the peace treaties, we dismantled the mightiest military force we had ever assembled. Armies were disbanded wholesale. Vast supplies of war equipment were liquidated or junked. Within two years after the end of the war, our defense spending had fallen by nearly \$70 billion. Our armed forces were slashed from more than 12 million to one and a half million men. We did not retain a single division in a state of combat readiness. We did not have a single military

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Press Release No. 4070
October 23, 1962

Statement by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, United States Representative
to the United Nations, in the Security Council, on Cuba.

I have asked for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to bring to your attention a grave threat to the Western Hemisphere and to the peace of the world.

Last night, the President of the United States reported the recent alarming military developments in Cuba. Permit me to remind you of the President's sobering words:

"Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere. Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning at 9 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And having now confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in full detail.

"The characteristics of these new missile sites indicate two distinct types of installations. Several of them include medium range ballistic missiles, capable of carrying a nuclear warhead for a distance of more than 1,000 nautical miles. Each of these missiles, in short, is capable of striking Washington, D.C., the Panama Canal, Cape Canaveral, Mexico City, or any other city in the Southeastern part of the United States, in Central America or in the Caribbean area.

"Additional sites not yet completed appear to be designed for intermediate range ballistic missiles -- capable of travelling more than twice as far -- and thus capable of striking most of the major cities in the Western Hemisphere, ranging as far north as Hudson's Bay, Canada, and as far south as Lima, Peru. In addition, jet bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, are now being uncrated and assembled in Cuba, while the necessary air bases are being prepared."

In view of this transformation of Cuba into a base for offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction, the President announced the initiation of a strict quarantine on all offensive military weapons under shipment to Cuba. He did so because, in the view of my Government, the recent developments in Cuba -- the importation of the cold war into the heart of the Americas -- constitute a threat to the peace of this hemisphere, and, indeed, to the peace of the world.

progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." And in one sentence, Paragraph 4, Article 2, they defined the necessary condition of a community of independent peoples:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

In this spirit, these fifty-one nations solemnly resolved to band together in a great cooperative quest for world peace and world progress. The adventure of the United Nations held out to humanity the bright hope of a new world -- a world securely founded in international peace, in national independence, in personal freedom, in respect for law, for social justice and betterment, and, in the words of the Charter, for "equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

The vision of San Francisco was the vision of a world community of independent nations, each freely developing according to its own traditions and its own genius, bound together by a common respect for the rights of other nations and by a common loyalty to the larger international order. This vision assumes that this earth is quite large enough to shelter a great variety of economic systems, political creeds, philosophical beliefs and religious convictions. The faith of the Charter is in a pluralistic world, a world of free choice, respecting the infinite diversity of mankind and dedicated to nations living together as good neighbors, in peace.

Like many peoples, we welcomed the world of the Charter, for our society is based on principles of choice and consent.

We believe the principles of an open society in the world order survive and flourish in the competitions of peace. We believe that freedom and diversity are the best climate for human creativity and social progress. We reject all fatalistic philosophies of history and all theories of political and social predestination. We doubt whether any nation has so absolute a grip on absolute truth that it is entitled to impose its idea of what is right on others. And we know that a world community of independent nations accepting a common frame of international order offers the best safeguard for the safety of our shores and the security of our people. Our commitment to the world of the Charter expresses both our deepest philosophical traditions and the most realistic interpretation of our national interest.

III.

Had we any other vision of the world, had we sought the path of empire, our opportunities for self-aggrandizement immediately after the war were ^{almost} unparalleled. In 1945, we were incomparably the greatest military power in the world. Our troops and planes were dispersed at strategic points around the globe. We had exclusive possession of the terror and promise of atomic energy. Our economic strength was unmatched. If the American purpose had been world dominion, there could have been no more propitious moment to set out on such a course.

Instead, our commitment, then as now, was to the world of the Charter -- the creation of a community of freely cooperating independent states bound together by the United Nations. In the service of this commitment, and without waiting for the peace treaties, we dismantled the mightiest military force we had ever assembled. Armies were disbanded wholesale. Vast supplies of war equipment were liquidated or junked. Within two years after the end of the war, our defense spending had fallen by nearly \$70 billion. Our armed forces were slashed from more than 12 million to one and a half million men. We did not retain a single division in a state of combat readiness. We did not have a single military alliance anywhere in the world. History has not seen, I believe, a more complete and comprehensive demonstration of a great nation's hope for peace and amity.

MORE

Instead of using our monopoly of atomic energy to extend our national power, we offered in 1946 to transfer the control of atomic energy to the United Nations.

Instead of using our overwhelming economic strength to extend our national power, we contributed more than \$2.6 billion to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, much of which went to the relief of suffering in the Communist countries. And after 1948, we contributed many more billions to the economic restoration of Europe -- and invited the Communist countries to participate as recipients of our assistance.

Instead of using our substance and strength to extend our national power, we supported the movement for independence which began to sweep through Asia and Africa -- the movement which has added 59 new members to the United Nations in the years since 1945. Since the war, we have contributed \$97 billion of economic and military assistance to other nations -- and, of this sum, \$53 billion has gone to the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I have often wondered what the world would be like today if the situation at the end of the war had been reversed -- if the United States had been ravaged and shattered by war, and if the Soviet Union had emerged intact in exclusive possession of the atomic bomb and overwhelming military and economic might. Would it have followed the same path and devoted itself to realizing the world of the Charter?

IV.

To ask this question suggests the central paradox of the United Nations. For among the states which pledged their fidelity to the idea of a pluralistic world in San Francisco were some who had an incompatible vision of the future world order.

Has the Soviet Union ever really joined the United Nations? Or does its philosophy of history and its conception of the future run counter to the pluralistic concept of the Charter?

Against the idea of diversity, Communism asserts the idea of uniformity; against freedom, inevitability; against choice, compulsion; against democracy, dogma; against independence, ideology; against tolerance, conformity. Its faith is that the iron laws of history will require every nation to traverse the same predestined path to the same predestined conclusion. Given this faith in a monolithic world, the very existence of diversity is a threat to the Communist future.

I do not assert that Communism must always remain a messianic faith. Like other fanaticisms of the past, it may in time lose its sense of infallibility and accept the diversity of human destiny. Already in some countries we see Communism subsiding into a local and limited ideology. There are those who have discerned the same evolution in the Soviet Union itself; and we may all earnestly hope that Chairman Khrushchev and his associates will renounce the dream of making the world over in the image of the Soviet Union. It must be the purpose of other nations to do what they can to hasten that day.

But that day has not yet arrived. The conflict between absolutist and pluralistic conceptions of the destiny of mankind remains the basic source of discord within the United Nations. It has given rise to what is known as the Cold War. Were it not for this conflict, this Organization would have made steady progress toward the world of choice and justice envisaged at San Francisco.

But because of the Soviet rejection of an open world, the hope for progress and for peace has been systematically frustrated. And in these halls we spend

It began even before the nations gathered at San Francisco. As soon as the defeat of the Nazis appeared certain, the Soviet Union began to abandon the policy of war-time cooperation to which it had turned for self-protection. In early 1945, Moscow instructed the communist parties of the West to purge themselves of the sin of cooperation, and to return to their pre-war view that democratic governments were by definition imperialistic and wicked. Within a few weeks after the meeting at Yalta, the Soviet Union took swift action in Rumania and Poland in brutal violation of the Yalta pledges of political freedom.

At the same time, it began a political offensive against the United States, charging that the American government -- the government of Franklin Roosevelt -- was engaged in secret peace negotiations with Hitler. Roosevelt replied to Stalin that he deeply resented these "vile misrepresentations." At the end of March 1945, Roosevelt cabled Winston Churchill that he was "watching with anxiety and concern the development of the Soviet attitude" and that he was "acutely aware of the dangers inherent in the present course of events, not only for the immediate issue but also the San Francisco Conference and future world cooperation."

It is important to recall these facts, because the Soviet Union has tried in the years since to pretend that its policy of aggression was a defensive response to the change of administration in the United States, or to Churchill's 1946 speech at Fulton, Missouri, or to some other event after the death of Roosevelt. But the historical record is clear. As soon as the Soviet government saw no further military need for the war-time coalition, it set out on its expansionist adventures.

The ink was hardly dry on the Charter before Moscow began its war against the world of the United Nations. The very first meeting of the Security Council -- and I was there -- was called to hear a complaint by Iran that Soviet troops had failed to withdraw from the northern part of that country on the date on which they had agreed to leave. Not only had they declined to go; they had installed a puppet regime on Iranian soil and had blocked Iranian troops from entering part of ^{Iran's} territory. The Soviet Union, in short, was violating the territorial integrity and denying the political independence of Iran -- and doing so by armed force. Eventually the United Nations forced a reluctant agreement from the Soviet Union to live up to its pledge.

This was only the beginning. At the time of the German surrender, the Red Army was in occupation of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Eastern Germany and most of Czechoslovakia. And there the Red Army stayed. It stayed in violation of the agreement reached at Yalta by the heads of the allied powers -- the agreement which pledged the independence and promised free elections to these nations. By 1948, five nations and half of a sixth, with a combined population of more than 90 million people, had been absorbed into the communist empire. To this day the peoples of Eastern Europe have never been permitted to exercise the Charter right of self-determination.

Before the suppression of Eastern Europe was complete, the Soviet Union was fomenting guerrilla warfare and sabotaging economic recovery -- in Greece and Turkey -- assailing neighboring regimes through all the instrumentalities of propaganda and subversion.

Nor were such activities confined to Europe. In Malaya -- in the Philippines -- in Burma -- in Indo-China the communists encouraged and supported guerrilla uprisings against constituted governments.

In one event after another, on one stage after another -- the rejection in the United Nations of the American plan for the internationalization of atomic energy, the rejection of the Marshall Plan, the blockade of Berlin and, finally, the invasion of South Korea -- the Soviet Union assailed political independence, resisted the world of the Charter and tried to impose its own.

Instead of using our overwhelming economic strength to extend our national power, we contributed more than \$2.6 billion to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, much of which went to the relief of suffering in the Communist countries. And after 1948, we contributed many more billions to the economic restoration of Europe -- and invited the Communist countries to participate as recipients of our assistance.

Instead of using our substance and strength to extend our national power, we supported the movement for independence which began to sweep through Asia and Africa -- the movement which has added 59 new members to the United Nations in the years since 1945. Since the war, we have contributed \$97 billion of economic and military assistance to other nations -- and, of this sum, \$53 billion has gone to the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I have often wondered what the world would be like today if the situation at the end of the war had been reversed -- if the United States had been ravaged and shattered by war, and if the Soviet Union had emerged intact in exclusive possession of the atomic bomb and overwhelming military and economic might. Would it have followed the same path and devoted itself to realizing the world of the Charter?

IV.

To ask this question suggests the central paradox of the United Nations. For among the states which pledged their fidelity to the idea of a pluralistic world in San Francisco were some who had an incompatible vision of the future world order.

Has the Soviet Union ever really joined the United Nations? Or does its philosophy of history and its conception of the future run counter to the pluralistic concept of the Charter?

Against the idea of diversity, Communism asserts the idea of uniformity; against freedom, inevitability; against choice, compulsion; against democracy, dogma; against independence, ideology; against tolerance, conformity. Its faith is that the iron laws of history will require every nation to traverse the same predestined path to the same predestined conclusion. Given this faith in a monolithic world, the very existence of diversity is a threat to the Communist future.

I do not assert that Communism must always remain a messianic faith. Like other fanaticisms of the past, it may in time lose its sense of infallibility and accept the diversity of human destiny. Already in some countries we see Communism subsiding into a local and limited ideology. There are those who have discerned the same evolution in the Soviet Union itself; and we may all earnestly hope that Chairman Khrushchev and his associates will renounce the dream of making the world over in the image of the Soviet Union. It must be the purpose of other nations to do what they can to hasten that day.

But that day has not yet arrived. The conflict between absolutist and pluralistic conceptions of the destiny of mankind remains the basic source of discord within the United Nations. It has given rise to what is known as the Cold War. Were it not for this conflict, this Organization would have made steady progress toward the world of choice and justice envisaged at San Francisco.

But because of the Soviet rejection of an open world, the hope for progress and for peace has been systematically frustrated. And in these halls we spend much of our time and energy either engaged in or avoiding this incessant conflict.

MORE

policy of war-time cooperation to which it had turned for self-protection. In early 1945, Moscow instructed the communist parties of the West to purge themselves of the sin of cooperation, and to return to their pre-war view that democratic governments were by definition imperialistic and wicked. Within a few weeks after the meeting at Yalta, the Soviet Union took swift action in Rumania and Poland in brutal violation of the Yalta pledges of political freedom.

At the same time, it began a political offensive against the United States, charging that the American government -- the government of Franklin Roosevelt -- was engaged in secret peace negotiations with Hitler. Roosevelt replied to Stalin that he deeply resented these "vile misrepresentations." At the end of March 1945, Roosevelt cabled Winston Churchill that he was "watching with anxiety and concern the development of the Soviet attitude" and that he was "acutely aware of the dangers inherent in the present course of events, not only for the immediate issue but also the San Francisco Conference and future world cooperation."

It is important to recall these facts, because the Soviet Union has tried in the years since to pretend that its policy of aggression was a defensive response to the change of administration in the United States, or to Churchill's 1946 speech at Fulton, Missouri, or to some other event after the death of Roosevelt. But the historical record is clear. As soon as the Soviet government saw no further military need for the war-time coalition, it set out on its expansionist adventures.

The ink was hardly dry on the Charter before Moscow began its war against the world of the United Nations. The very first meeting of the Security Council -- and I was there -- was called to hear a complaint by Iran that Soviet troops had failed to withdraw from the northern part of that country on the date on which they had agreed to leave. Not only had they declined to go; they had installed a puppet regime on Iranian soil and had blocked Iranian troops from entering part of ^{Iran's} territory. The Soviet Union, in short, was violating the territorial integrity and denying the political independence of Iran -- and doing so by armed force. Eventually the United Nations forced a reluctant agreement from the Soviet Union to live up to its pledge.

This was only the beginning. At the time of the German surrender, the Red Army was in occupation of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Eastern Germany and most of Czechoslovakia. And there the Red Army stayed. It stayed in violation of the agreement reached at Yalta by the heads of the allied powers -- the agreement which pledged the independence and promised free elections to these nations. By 1948, five nations and half of a sixth, with a combined population of more than 90 million people, had been absorbed into the communist empire. To this day the peoples of Eastern Europe have never been permitted to exercise the Charter right of self-determination.

Before the suppression of Eastern Europe was complete, the Soviet Union was fomenting guerrilla warfare and sabotaging economic recovery -- in Greece and Turkey -- assailing neighboring regimes through all the instrumentalities of propaganda and subversion.

Nor were such activities confined to Europe. In Malaya -- in the Philippines -- in Burma -- in Indo-China the communists encouraged and supported guerrilla uprisings against constituted governments.

In one event after another, on one stage after another -- the rejection in the United Nations of the American plan for the internationalization of atomic energy, the rejection of the Marshall Plan, the blockade of Berlin and, finally, the invasion of South Korea -- the Soviet Union assailed political independence, resisted the world of the Charter and tried to impose its design of a communist future.

MORE

Let me recall to this Council, Mr. President, the record with regard to international agreements.

The Soviet government has signed treaties of non-aggression, as it did with the Baltic states and Finland -- and then systematically invaded the countries whose integrity it had solemnly promised to respect.

At Yalta and in a succession of peace treaties, it pledged to the liberated countries of Eastern Europe "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live -- the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them" -- and then it systematically denied those rights and consolidated that deprivation.

In 1945 it signed a thirty-year pact of mutual assistance and non-aggression with China, pledging that its military aid and economic support would be "given entirely to the National Government as the Central Government of China" -- and violated that treaty almost before the Chinese negotiators had left Moscow.

At Potsdam it promised that "all democratic political parties with rights of assembly and of public discussion shall be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany" -- and within its own zone promptly repudiated that promise. At Geneva in 1954 it agreed not to introduce arms into Vietnam -- and sent guns and ammunition to the Viet Minh.

It denounced nuclear testing -- and then violated the moratorium which for three years had spared the world the danger of nuclear tests.

Within this Council, it has thwarted the majority will 100 times by the use of the veto.

The record is clear: treaties, agreements, pledges and the morals of international relations were never an obstacle to the Soviet Union under Stalin. No one has said so more eloquently than Chairman Khrushchev.

VI.

With the death of Stalin in 1953, the world had a resurgence of hope. No one can question that Chairman Khrushchev has altered many things in the Soviet Union. He has introduced welcome measures of normalization in many sectors of Soviet life. He has abandoned the classic communist concept of the inevitability of war. He has recognized -- intermittently, at least -- the appalling dangers of nuclear weapons.

But there is one thing he has not altered -- and that is the basic drive to abolish the world of the Charter, to destroy the hope of a pluralistic world order. He has not altered the basic drive to fulfill the prophecies of Marx and Lenin and make all the world communist. And he has demonstrated his singleness of purpose in a succession of aggressive acts -- the suppression of the East German uprisings in 1953 and the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, in the series of manufactured crises and truculent demands that the Allies get out of West Berlin, in the resumption of nuclear testing, in the explosion -- defying a resolution of the General Assembly -- of a 50-megaton bomb, in the continued stimulation of guerrilla and subversive warfare all over the globe, in the compulsive intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, whether by diplomatic assault, by economic pressure, by mobs and riots, by propaganda, or by espionage.

The world welcomed the process known as "de-Stalinization" and the movement toward a more normal life within the Soviet Union. But the world has not yet seen comparable changes in Soviet foreign policy.

It is this which has shadowed the world since the end of the second World War -- which has dimmed our hopes of peace and progress, which has forced those nations determined to defend their freedom to take measures in their own self-defense. In this effort, the leadership has inevitably fallen in large degree on the United States. I do not believe that every action we have taken in the effort to strengthen the independence of nations has necessarily been correct; we do not subscribe to the thesis of national infallibility for any nation. But we do take great pride in the role we have performed.

Our response to the remorseless Soviet expansionism has taken many forms.

We have sought loyally to support the United Nations, to be faithful to the world of the Charter, and to build an operating system that acts, and does not talk, for peace.

We have never refused to negotiate. We have sat at conference after conference seeking peaceful solutions to menacing conflicts.

We have worked for general and complete disarmament under international supervision. We have tried earnestly and -- we won't stop trying -- to reach an agreement to end all nuclear testing.

We have declined to be provoked into actions which might lead to war -- in face of such challenges as the Berlin blockade, such affronts to humanity as the repression of the Hungarian revolt, such atrocities as the erection of that shameful wall to fence in the East Germans who had fled to the West in such vast multitudes.

We have assisted nations, both allied and unaligned, who have shown a will to maintain their national independence. To shield them and ourselves, we have rebuilt our armed forces -- established defensive alliances -- and, year after year, reluctantly devoted a large share of our resources to national defense.

Together with our allies, we have installed certain bases overseas as a prudent precaution in response to the clear and persistent Soviet threats. In 1959, 18 months after the boasts of Chairman Khrushchev had called the world's attention to the threat of Soviet long range missiles, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- without concealment or deceit -- as a consequence of agreements freely negotiated and publicly declared, placed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the NATO area. The warheads of these missiles remain in the custody of the United States, and the decision for their use rests in the hands of the President of the United States of America in association with the governments involved.

VIII.

I regret that people here at the United Nations seem to believe that the Cold War is a private struggle between two great super-powers. It isn't a private struggle; it is a world civil war -- a contest between the pluralistic world and the monolithic world -- a contest between the world of the Charter and the world of Communist conformity. Every nation that is now independent and wants to remain independent is involved, whether they know it or not. Every nation is involved in this grim, costly, distasteful division in the world, no matter how remote and how uninterested.

We all recognized this in 1950, when the Communists decided to test how far they could go by direct military action and unleashed the invasion of South Korea. The response of the United Nations taught them that overt aggression would produce not appeasement, but resistance. This remains the essential lesson. The United Nations stood firm in Korea because we knew the consequences of appeasement.

The policy of appeasement is always intended to strengthen the moderates in

The Soviet government has signed treaties of non-aggression, as it did with the Baltic states and Finland -- and then systematically invaded the countries whose integrity it had solemnly promised to respect.

At Yalta and in a succession of peace treaties, it pledged to the liberated countries of Eastern Europe "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live -- the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them" -- and then it systematically denied those rights and consolidated that deprivation.

In 1945 it signed a thirty-year pact of mutual assistance and non-aggression with China, pledging that its military aid and economic support would be "given entirely to the National Government as the Central Government of China" -- and violated that treaty almost before the Chinese negotiators had left Moscow.

At Potsdam it promised that "all democratic political parties with rights of assembly and of public discussion shall be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany" -- and within its own zone promptly repudiated that promise. At Geneva in 1954 it agreed not to introduce arms into Vietnam -- and sent guns and ammunition to the Viet Minh.

It denounced nuclear testing -- and then violated the moratorium which for three years had spared the world the danger of nuclear tests.

Within this Council, it has thwarted the majority will 100 times by the use of the veto.

The record is clear: treaties, agreements, pledges and the morals of international relations were never an obstacle to the Soviet Union under Stalin. No one has said so more eloquently than Chairman Khrushchev.

VI.

With the death of Stalin in 1953, the world had a resurgence of hope. No one can question that Chairman Khrushchev has altered many things in the Soviet Union. He has introduced welcome measures of normalization in many sectors of Soviet life. He has abandoned the classic communist concept of the inevitability of war. He has recognized -- intermittently, at least -- the appalling dangers of nuclear weapons.

But there is one thing he has not altered -- and that is the basic drive to abolish the world of the Charter, to destroy the hope of a pluralistic world order. He has not altered the basic drive to fulfill the prophecies of Marx and Lenin and make all the world communist. And he has demonstrated his singleness of purpose in a succession of aggressive acts -- the suppression of the East German uprisings in 1953 and the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, in the series of manufactured crises and truculent demands that the Allies get out of West Berlin, in the resumption of nuclear testing, in the explosion -- defying a resolution of the General Assembly -- of a 50-megaton bomb, in the continued stimulation of guerrilla and subversive warfare all over the globe, in the compulsive intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, whether by diplomatic assault, by economic pressure, by mobs and riots, by propaganda, or by espionage.

The world welcomed the process known as "de-Stalinization" and the movement toward a more normal life within the Soviet Union. But the world has not yet seen comparable changes in Soviet foreign policy.

MORE

on the United States. I do not believe that every action we have taken in the effort to strengthen the independence of nations has necessarily been correct; we do not subscribe to the thesis of national infallibility for any nation. But we do take great pride in the role we have performed.

Our response to the remorseless Soviet expansionism has taken many forms.

We have sought loyally to support the United Nations, to be faithful to the world of the Charter, and to build an operating system that acts, and does not talk, for peace.

We have never refused to negotiate. We have sat at conference after conference seeking peaceful solutions to menacing conflicts.

We have worked for general and complete disarmament under international supervision. We have tried earnestly and -- we won't stop trying -- to reach an agreement to end all nuclear testing.

We have declined to be provoked into actions which might lead to war -- in face of such challenges as the Berlin blockade, such affronts to humanity as the repression of the Hungarian revolt, such atrocities as the erection of that shameful wall to fence in the East Germans who had fled to the West in such vast multitudes.

We have assisted nations, both allied and unaligned, who have shown a will to maintain their national independence. To shield them and ourselves, we have rebuilt our armed forces -- established defensive alliances -- and, year after year, reluctantly devoted a large share of our resources to national defense.

Together with our allies, we have installed certain bases overseas as a prudent precaution in response to the clear and persistent Soviet threats. In 1959, 18 months after the boasts of Chairman Khrushchev had called the world's attention to the threat of Soviet long range missiles, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- without concealment or deceit -- as a consequence of agreements freely negotiated and publicly declared, placed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the NATO area. The warheads of these missiles remain in the custody of the United States, and the decision for their use rests in the hands of the President of the United States of America in association with the governments involved.

VIII.

I regret that people here at the United Nations seem to believe that the Cold War is a private struggle between two great super-powers. It isn't a private struggle; it is a world civil war -- a contest between the pluralistic world and the monolithic world -- a contest between the world of the Charter and the world of Communist conformity. Every nation that is now independent and wants to remain independent is involved, whether they know it or not. Every nation is involved in this grim, costly, distasteful division in the world, no matter how remote and how uninterested.

We all recognized this in 1950, when the Communists decided to test how far they could go by direct military action and unleashed the invasion of South Korea. The response of the United Nations taught them that overt aggression would produce not appeasement, but resistance. This remains the essential lesson. The United Nations stood firm in Korea because we knew the consequences of appeasement.

The policy of appeasement is always intended to strengthen the moderates in the country appeased; but its effect is always to strengthen the extremists. We are prepared to meet and reconcile every legitimate Soviet concern; but we have only contempt for blackmail. We know that every retreat before intimidation strengthens those who say that the threat of force can always achieve Communist objectives -- and undermines those in the Soviet Union who are urging caution and restraint, even cooperation.

MORE

Reluctantly and repeatedly, we have to face the sad fact that the only way to reinforce those on the other side who are for moderation and peaceful competition is to make it absolutely clear that aggression will be met with resistance, and force with force.

The time has come for this Council to decide whether to make a serious attempt to bring peace to the world -- or to let the United Nations stand idly by while the vast plan of piecemeal aggression unfolds, conducted in the hope that no single issue will seem consequential enough to mobilize the resistance of the free peoples. For my own government, this question is not in doubt. We remain committed to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and we intend to defend them.

IX.

We are engaged today in a crucial test of those principles. Nearly four years ago a revolution took place on the island of Cuba. This revolution overthrew a hated dictatorship in the name of democratic freedom and social progress. Dr. Castro made explicit promises to the people of Cuba. He promised them the restoration of the 1940 constitution abandoned by the Batista dictatorship; a "provisional government of entirely civilian character that will return the country to normality and hold general elections within a period of no more than one year; "truly honest" elections along with "full and untrammelled" freedom of information and political activity.

That is what Dr. Castro offered the people of Cuba. That is what the people of Cuba accepted. Many in my own country and throughout the Americas sympathized with Dr. Castro's stated objectives. The United States Government offered immediate diplomatic recognition and stood ready to provide the revolutionary regime with economic assistance.

But a grim struggle took place within the revolutionary regime, between its democratic and its ^{predominant} Communist wings -- between those who overthrew Batista to bring freedom to Cuba, and those who overthrew Batista to bring Cuba to Communism. In a few months the struggle was over. Brave men who had fought with Castro in the Sierra Maestra and who had organized the underground against Batista in the cities were assailed, arrested, and driven from office into prison or exile, all for the single offense of anti-communism, all for the single offense of believing in the principles of the revolution they fought for. By the end of 1959, the Communist Party was the only party in Cuba permitted freedom of political action. By early 1960, the Castro regime was entering into intimate economic and political relations with the Soviet Union.

It is well to remember that all these events took place months before the United States stopped buying Cuban sugar in the summer of 1960 -- and many more months before exactions upon our Embassy in Havana forced the suspension of diplomatic relations in December 1960.

As the communization of Cuba proceeded, more and more democratic Cubans, men who had fought for freedom in the front ranks, were forced into exile. They were eager to return to their homeland and to save their revolution from betrayal. In the spring of 1961, they tried to liberate their country, under the political leadership of Dr. Castro's first Prime Minister, and of a Revolutionary Council composed without exception of men who had opposed Batista and backed the Revolution. The people and government of the United States sympathized with these men -- as throughout our history Americans have always sympathized with those who sought to liberate their native lands from despotism. I have no apologies to make for that sympathy, or for the assistance which these brave Cuban refugees received from our lands. But I would point out, too, that my Government, still forbearing, refrained from direct intervention. It sent no American troops to Cuba.

In the year and a half since, Dr. Castro has continued the communization of his unfortunate country. The 1940 constitution was never restored. Elections were never held and their promise withdrawn -- though Dr. Castro's twelve months have stretched to forty-two. The Castro regime fastened on Cuba an iron system of repression. It eradicated human and civil rights. It openly transformed Cuba into a communist satellite and a police state. Whatever benefit this regime might have brought to Cuba has long since been cancelled out by the firing squads, the drum-

X.

Yet even these violations of human rights, repellent as they are -- even this dictatorship, cruel as it may be -- would not, if kept within the confines of one country, constitute a direct threat to the peace and independence of other states. The threat lies in the submission of the Castro regime to the will of an aggressive foreign power. It lies in its readiness to break up the relations of confidence and cooperation among the good neighbors of this hemisphere -- at a time when the Alliance for Progress, that vast effort to raise living standards for all peoples of the Americas, has given new vitality and hope to the inter-American system.

Let me make it absolutely clear what the issue of Cuba is. It is not an issue of revolution. This hemisphere has seen many revolutions, including the one which gave my own nation its independence.

It is not an issue of reform. My nation has lived happily with other countries which have had thorough-going and fundamental social transformations like Mexico and Bolivia. The whole point of the Alliance for Progress is to bring about an economic and social revolution in the Americas.

It is not an issue of socialism. As Secretary of State Rusk said at Punta del Este in February: "Our hemisphere has room for a diversity of economic systems."

It is not an issue of dictatorship. The American republics have lived with dictators before. If this were his only fault, they could even live with Dr. Castro.

The foremost objection of the states of the Americas to the Castro regime is not because it is revolutionary, not because it is socialistic, not because it is dictatorial, not even because Dr. Castro perverted a noble revolution in the interests of a squalid totalitarianism. It is because he has aided and abetted an invasion of this hemisphere -- and an invasion at just the time when the hemisphere is making a new and unprecedented effort for economic progress and social reform.

The crucial fact is that Cuba has given the Soviet Union a bridgehead and staging area in this hemisphere -- that it has invited an extra-continental, anti-democratic and expansionist power into the bosom of the American family -- that it has made itself an accomplice in the communist enterprise of world dominion.

attempt to bring peace to the world -- or to let the United Nations stand idly by while the vast plan of piecemeal aggression unfolds, conducted in the hope that no single issue will seem consequential enough to mobilize the resistance of the free peoples. For my own government, this question is not in doubt. We remain committed to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and we intend to defend them.

IX.

We are engaged today in a crucial test of those principles. Nearly four years ago a revolution took place on the island of Cuba. This revolution overthrew a hated dictatorship in the name of democratic freedom and social progress. Dr. Castro made explicit promises to the people of Cuba. He promised them the restoration of the 1940 constitution abandoned by the Batista dictatorship; a "provisional government of entirely civilian character that will return the country to normality and hold general elections within a period of no more than one year; "truly honest" elections along with "full and untrammelled" freedom of information and political activity.

That is what Dr. Castro offered the people of Cuba. That is what the people of Cuba accepted. Many in my own country and throughout the Americas sympathized with Dr. Castro's stated objectives. The United States Government offered immediate diplomatic recognition and stood ready to provide the revolutionary regime with economic assistance.

But a grim struggle took place within the revolutionary regime, between its democratic and its ^{predominant} Communist wings -- between those who overthrew Batista to bring freedom to Cuba, and those who overthrew Batista to bring Cuba to Communism. In a few months the struggle was over. Brave men who had fought with Castro in the Sierra Maestra and who had organized the underground against Batista in the cities were assailed, arrested, and driven from office into prison or exile, all for the single offense of anti-communism, all for the single offense of believing in the principles of the revolution they fought for. By the end of 1959, the Communist Party was the only party in Cuba permitted freedom of political action. By early 1960, the Castro regime was entering into intimate economic and political relations with the Soviet Union.

It is well to remember that all these events took place months before the United States stopped buying Cuban sugar in the summer of 1960 -- and many more months before exactions upon our Embassy in Havana forced the suspension of diplomatic relations in December 1960.

As the communization of Cuba proceeded, more and more democratic Cubans, men who had fought for freedom in the front ranks, were forced into exile. They were eager to return to their homeland and to save their revolution from betrayal. In the spring of 1961, they tried to liberate their country, under the political leadership of Dr. Castro's first Prime Minister, and of a Revolutionary Council composed without exception of men who had opposed Batista and backed the Revolution. The people and government of the United States sympathized with these men -- as throughout our history Americans have always sympathized with those who sought to liberate their native lands from despotism. I have no apologies to make for that sympathy, or for the assistance which these brave Cuban refugees received from our lands. But I would point out, too, that my Government, still forbearing, refrained from direct intervention. It sent no American troops to Cuba.

In the year and a half since, Dr. Castro has continued the communization of his unfortunate country. The 1940 constitution was never restored. Elections were never held and their promise withdrawn -- though Dr. Castro's twelve months have stretched to forty-two. The Castro regime fastened on Cuba an iron system of repression. It eradicated human and civil rights. It openly transformed Cuba into a communist satellite and a police state. Whatever benefit this regime might have brought to Cuba has long since been cancelled out by the firing squads, the drum-head executions, the hunger and misery, the suppression of civil and political and cultural freedom.

MORE

Yet even these violations of human rights, repellent as they are -- even this dictatorship, cruel as it may be -- would not, if kept within the confines of one country, constitute a direct threat to the peace and independence of other states. The threat lies in the submission of the Castro regime to the will of an aggressive foreign power. It lies in its readiness to break up the relations of confidence and cooperation among the good neighbors of this hemisphere -- at a time when the Alliance for Progress, that vast effort to raise living standards for all peoples of the Americas, has given new vitality and hope to the inter-American system.

Let me make it absolutely clear what the issue of Cuba is. It is not an issue of revolution. This hemisphere has seen many revolutions, including the one which gave my own nation its independence.

It is not an issue of reform. My nation has lived happily with other countries which have had thorough-going and fundamental social transformations like Mexico and Bolivia. The whole point of the Alliance for Progress is to bring about an economic and social revolution in the Americas.

It is not an issue of socialism. As Secretary of State Rusk said at Punta del Este in February: "Our hemisphere has room for a diversity of economic systems."

It is not an issue of dictatorship. The American republics have lived with dictators before. If this were his only fault, they could even live with Dr. Castro.

The foremost objection of the states of the Americas to the Castro regime is not because it is revolutionary, not because it is socialistic, not because it is dictatorial, not even because Dr. Castro perverted a noble revolution in the interests of a squalid totalitarianism. It is because he has aided and abetted an invasion of this hemisphere -- and an invasion at just the time when the hemisphere is making a new and unprecedented effort for economic progress and social reform.

The crucial fact is that Cuba has given the Soviet Union a bridgehead and staging area in this hemisphere -- that it has invited an extra-continental, anti-democratic and expansionist power into the bosom of the American family -- that it has made itself an accomplice in the communist enterprise of world dominion.

MORE

The statement issued by the Soviet Government this morning does not deny these facts -- which is in refreshing contrast to the categorical assurances on this subject which they had previously given.

However, this same statement repeats the extraordinary claim that Soviet arms in Cuba are of a "defensive character." I should like to know what the Soviets consider "offensive" weapons. In the Soviet lexicon evidently all weapons are purely defensive, even weapons that can strike from 1,000 to 2,000 miles away. Words can be stretched only so far without losing their meaning altogether. But semantic disputes are fruitless, and the fact remains that the Soviet has upset the precarious balance and created a new and dangerous situation in a new area.

This is precisely the sort of action which the Soviet Government is so fond of denouncing as "a policy of positions of strength." Consequently, I invite the attention of the Council to another remark in the Soviet Government's statement of this morning: "Only madmen bank on a policy of positions of strength and believe that this policy will bring any success, will help make it possible to impose their orders on other States."

I need only mention one other curious remark in the Soviet Government's statement of today, and I quote once more: "Who gave the United States the right to assume the role of the master of destinies of other countries and peoples? ... Cuba belongs to the Cuban peoples and only they can be masters of their destiny." This latter sentence is, of course, a succinct statement of United States policy toward Cuba. It is, however, very far from being Soviet policy toward Cuba.

When the Soviet Union sends thousands of military technicians to its satellite in the Western Hemisphere -- when it sends jet bombers capable of delivering nuclear weapons -- when it installs in Cuba missiles capable of carrying atomic warheads and of obliterating the Panama Canal, Mexico City and Washington -- when it prepares sites for additional missiles with a range of 2,200 miles and a capacity to strike at targets from Peru to Hudson's Bay -- when it does these things under the cloak of secrecy and to the accompaniment of premeditated deception -- when its actions are in flagrant violation of the policies of the Organization of American States and of the Charter of the United Nations -- this clearly is a threat to this hemisphere. And when it thus upsets the precarious balance in the world, it is a threat to the whole world.

We now know that the Soviet Union, not content with Dr. Castro's oath of fealty, not content with the destruction of Cuban independence,

not content with the extension of Soviet power into the Western Hemisphere, not content with a challenge to the Inter-American system and the United Nations Charter, has decided to transform Cuba into a base for Communist aggression, into a base for putting all of the Americas under the nuclear gun and thereby intensify the Soviet diplomacy of blackmail in every part of the world.

In our passion for peace, we have forbore greatly. But there must be limits to forbearance, if forbearance is not to become the diagram for the destruction of this Organization. Dr. Castro transformed Cuba into a totalitarian dictatorship with impunity -- he extinguished the rights of political freedom with impunity -- he aligned himself with the Soviet bloc with impunity -- he accepted defensive weapons from the Soviet Union with impunity -- he welcomed thousands of Communists into Cuba with impunity -- but, when, with cold deliberation, he turns his country over to the Soviet Union for a long-range missile launching base, and thus carries the Soviet program for aggression into the heart of the Americas, the day of forbearance is past.

XIV.

If the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere should accept this new phase of aggression, we would be delinquent in our obligations to world peace. If the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere should accept this basic disturbance of the world's structure of power, we would invite a new surge of Communist aggression at every point along the

We hope that Chairman Khrushchev has not made a miscalculation, that he has not mistaken forbearance for weakness. We cannot believe that he has deluded himself into supposing that though we have power, we lack nerve; that, though we have weapons, we are without the will to use them.

We still hope, we still pray that the worst may be avoided -- that the Soviet leadership will call an end to this ominous adventure. Accordingly, the President has initiated steps to quarantine Cuba against further imports of offensive military equipment. Because the entire inter-American system is challenged, the President last night called for an immediate meeting of the Organ of Consultation of the Organization of the American States, to consider this threat to hemispheric security and to invoke Article 6 and 8 of the Rio Treaty in support of all necessary action. They are meeting now. The results of their deliberations will soon be available to you.

Mr. President, I am submitting today a resolution to the Security Council designed to find a way out of this calamitous situation.

This resolution calls, as an interim measure under Article 40 of the Charter, for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other offensive weapons.

It further authorizes and requests the Acting Secretary General to despatch to Cuba a United Nations observer corps to assure and report on compliance with this resolution.

Upon UN certification of compliance, it calls for the termination of the measures of quarantine against military shipments to Cuba.

And, in conclusion, it urgently recommends that the United States of America and the Soviet Union confer promptly on measures to remove the existing threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere and the peace of the world, and to report thereon to the Security Council.

XV

Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Organization of American States this afternoon adopted a resolution by 19 affirmative votes containing the following operative paragraphs:

"The Council of the Organization of Inter-American States, meeting as the Provisional Organ of Consultation, resolved:

1. To call for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other weapons with any offensive capability;
2. To recommend that the Member States in accordance with Articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance take all measures individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they may deem necessary, to insure that the government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet power military material and related supplies which may threaten the peace and the security of the continent and to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive capability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and the security of the continent;
3. Decides to inform the Security Council of the United Nations of this resolution in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, and expresses the hope that the Security Council will, in accordance with the resolution introduced by the United States, dismantle...

the Soviets consider "offensive" weapons. In the Soviet lexicon evidently all weapons are purely defensive, even weapons that can strike from 1,000 to 2,000 miles away. Words can be stretched only so far without losing their meaning altogether. But semantic disputes are fruitless, and the fact remains that the Soviet has upset the precarious balance and created a new and dangerous situation in a new area.

This is precisely the sort of action which the Soviet Government is so fond of denouncing as "a policy of positions of strength." Consequently, I invite the attention of the Council to another remark in the Soviet Government's statement of this morning: "Only madmen bank on a policy of positions of strength and believe that this policy will bring any success, will help make it possible to impose their orders on other States."

I need only mention one other curious remark in the Soviet Government's statement of today, and I quote once more: "Who gave the United States the right to assume the role of the master of destinies of other countries and peoples? ... Cuba belongs to the Cuban peoples and only they can be masters of their destiny." This latter sentence is, of course, a succinct statement of United States policy toward Cuba. It is, however, very far from being Soviet policy toward Cuba.

When the Soviet Union sends thousands of military technicians to its satellite in the Western Hemisphere -- when it sends jet bombers capable of delivering nuclear weapons -- when it installs in Cuba missiles capable of carrying atomic warheads and of obliterating the Panama Canal, Mexico City and Washington -- when it prepares sites for additional missiles with a range of 2,200 miles and a capacity to strike at targets from Peru to Hudson's Bay -- when it does these things under the cloak of secrecy and to the accompaniment of premeditated deception -- when its actions are in flagrant violation of the policies of the Organization of American States and of the Charter of the United Nations -- this clearly is a threat to this hemisphere. And when it thus upsets the precarious balance in the world, it is a threat to the whole world.

We now know that the Soviet Union, not content with Dr. Castro's oath of fealty, not content with the destruction of Cuban independence, not content with the extension of Soviet power into the Western Hemisphere, not content with a challenge to the Inter-American system and the United Nations Charter, has decided to transform Cuba into a base for Communist aggression, into a base for putting all of the Americas under the nuclear gun and thereby intensify the Soviet diplomacy of blackmail in every part of the world.

In our passion for peace, we have forbore greatly. But there must be limits to forbearance, if forbearance is not to become the diagram for the destruction of this Organization. Dr. Castro transformed Cuba into a totalitarian dictatorship with impunity -- he extinguished the rights of political freedom with impunity -- he aligned himself with the Soviet bloc with impunity -- he accepted defensive weapons from the Soviet Union with impunity -- he welcomed thousands of Communists into Cuba with impunity -- but, when, with cold deliberation, he turns his country over to the Soviet Union for a long-range missile launching base, and thus carries the Soviet program for aggression into the heart of the Americas, the day of forbearance is past.

XIV.

If the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere should accept this new phase of aggression, we would be delinquent in our obligations to world peace. If the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere should accept this basic disturbance of the world's structure of power, we would invite a new surge of Communist aggression at every point along the frontier which divides the Communist world from the democratic world. If we do not stand firm here, our adversaries may think that we will stand firm nowhere -- and we guarantee a heightening of the world civil war to new levels of intensity and danger.

MORE

though we have weapons, we are without the will to use them.

We still hope, we still pray that the worst may be avoided -- that the Soviet leadership will call an end to this ominous adventure. Accordingly, the President has initiated steps to quarantine Cuba against further imports of offensive military equipment. Because the entire inter-American system is challenged, the President last night called for an immediate meeting of the Organ of Consultation of the Organization of the American States, to consider this threat to hemispheric security and to invoke Article 6 and 8 of the Rio Treaty in support of all necessary action. They are meeting now. The results of their deliberations will soon be available to you.

Mr. President, I am submitting today a resolution to the Security Council designed to find a way out of this calamitous situation.

This resolution calls, as an interim measure under Article 40 of the Charter, for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other offensive weapons.

It further authorizes and requests the Acting Secretary General to despatch to Cuba a United Nations observer corps to assure and report on compliance with this resolution.

Upon UN certification of compliance, it calls for the termination of the measures of quarantine against military shipments to Cuba.

And, in conclusion, it urgently recommends that the United States of America and the Soviet Union confer promptly on measures to remove the existing threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere and the peace of the world, and to report thereon to the Security Council.

XV

Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Organization of American States this afternoon adopted a resolution by 19 affirmative votes containing the following operative paragraphs:

"The Council of the Organization of Inter-American States, meeting as the Provisional Organ of Consultation, resolved:

1. To call for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other weapons with any offensive capability;
2. To recommend that the Member States in accordance with Articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance take all measures individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they may deem necessary, to insure that the government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet power military material and related supplies which may threaten the peace and the security of the continent and to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive capability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and the security of the continent;
3. Decides to inform the Security Council of the United Nations of this resolution in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, and expresses the hope that the Security Council will, in accordance with the resolution introduced by the United States, dispatch United Nations observers to Cuba at the earliest moment."

MORE

Mr. President, the issue which confronts the Security Council today is grave. Since the end of the Second World War, there has been no threat to the vision of peace so profound -- no challenge to the world of the Charter so fateful. The hopes of mankind are concentrated in this room. The action we take may determine the future of civilization. I know that this Council will approach the issue with a full sense of our responsibility and a solemn understanding of the import of our deliberations.

There is a road to peace. The beginning of that road is marked out in the resolution I have submitted for your consideration. If we act promptly we will have another chance to take up again the dreadful questions of nuclear arms and military bases and the means and causes of aggression and war -- to take them up and do something about them.

This is a solemn and significant day for the life of the United Nations and the hope of world community. Let it be remembered, not as the day when the world came to the edge of nuclear war, but as the day when men resolved to let nothing thereafter stop them in their quest for peace.

#####

DRAFT FOLLOWS

Mr. President:

Seventeen years ago, the representatives of fifty-one nations gathered in San Francisco to adopt the Charter of the United Nations. These nations stated with clarity and eloquence the high purpose which brought them together.

They announced their common determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ... to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights ... to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." And in one sentence, Paragraph 4, Article 2, they defined the necessary condition of a community of independent peoples:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

They recognized that individual nation-states, each striving for itself, could not accomplish these aims. They solemnly resolved to band together in a great cooperative quest for world peace and world progress.

II

The adventure of the United Nations held out to humanity the shining hope of a new world — a world securely founded in international peace, in national independence, in personal freedom, in respect for law and in dedication to social justice and betterment, and, in the words of the

Charter,

Charter, of "equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

The vision of San Francisco is the vision of a world community of independent nations, each freely developing according to its own traditions and its own genius, bound together by a common respect for the rights of other nations and by a common loyalty to the larger international order. This vision assumes that this earth of ours is quite large enough to shelter a great variety of economic systems, political creeds, philosophical beliefs and religious convictions. The faith of the Charter is in a pluralistic world, a world of free choice, respecting the infinite diversity of mankind and dedicated to living together as good neighbors, in peace.

We welcome the world of the Charter -- the pluralistic world order -- for several reasons. Our own society is based on principles of choice and consent, and we have a natural preference for such principles in the world order. Moreover, we have sufficient confidence in the principles of an open society to be sure that they will survive and flourish in the competitions of peace. We believe that freedom and diversity provide the best climate for human creativity and social progress. We reject all fatalistic philosophies of history and all theories of political and social predestination. We doubt whether any nation has so absolute a grip on Absolute Truth that it is entitled to impose its idea of what is right on others by fire and the sword. And we know that the world of the United Nations Charter -- a world community of independent nations accepting a common frame of international order -- offers the best safeguard for the safety of our shores and the security of our people. Our

commitment

commitment to the world of the Charter expresses both our deepest philosophical traditions and the most realistic interpretation of our national interest.

III

Had we any other vision of the world, had we sought the path of empire, we had unparalleled opportunities for self-aggrandizement immediately after the war. In 1945, we were incomparably the greatest military power in the world. Our troops and planes were dispersed at strategic points around the globe. We had exclusive possession of the terror and promise of atomic energy. Our economic strength was unmatched. If the American purpose had been world dominion, there could have been no more propitious moment for us to set out on a course of world conquest.

But such a course could not have been farther from our thoughts. Our commitment, then as now, was to the world of the Charter — to the creation of a community of freely-cooperating independent states under the United Nations. In the service of this commitment, and without waiting for the peace treaties, we dismantled the largest military force we had ever assembled in our history. Troops were discharged wholesale. Vast supplies of war equipment were junked or sold at bargain prices. In the twelve months after the end of the war, our defense spending fell by \$100 billion (chk). Within two years our armed forces were slashed from more than 12 million to one and a half million men. We did not retain a single division in a state of combat readiness. We did not have a single military alliance anywhere in the world. The world has not seen, I believe,

I believe, a more complete and comprehensive demonstration of a great nation's hope for peace and amity.

Instead of using our monopoly of atomic energy to extend our national power, we offered in 1946 to transfer the control of atomic energy to the United Nations.

Instead of using our overwhelming economic strength to extend our national power, we contributed more than \$1 billion (chk) to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, much of which went to the relief of suffering in the communist countries. And after 1948 we contributed more billions to the economic restoration of Europe — and invited the communist countries to participate as recipients of our assistance.

Instead of using our economic and military strength to extend our national power in the underdeveloped world, we supported the movement for national independence which began to sweep through Asia and Africa — the movement which has added ___ new members to the United Nations in the years since 1945. Since the war, we have contributed \$___ billion of economic and military assistance to other nations — and, of this sum, \$___ billion has gone to the nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

I have often wondered what the world would be like today if the situation at the end of the war had been reversed — if the United States had been ravaged and shattered by war, and if the Soviet Union had emerged relatively intact in exclusive possession of the atomic bomb and overweening military and economic might. Does anyone suppose for a moment that the Soviet Union would have followed the same path of restraint? Does anyone

suppose

suppose that the Soviet Union would have devoted itself to realizing the world of the Charter?

IV

To ask this question is to investigate the central paradox of the United Nations. For among the states which pledged their fidelity to the idea of a pluralistic world in San Francisco were some who took that pledge with secret reservations -- for they were sworn to a contrary and incompatible vision of the future world order. Can anyone in this chamber say that the Soviet Union has ever really joined the United Nations? Can anyone say that the Soviet Union has ever really dedicated itself to the world of the Charter? The vision of a pluralistic world runs counter to its whole philosophy of history and to its whole conception of the future. Against the idea of diversity, communism asserts the idea of uniformity; against freedom, inevitability; against choice, compulsion; against democracy, dogma; against independence, ideology; against tolerance, tyranny. Its faith is that the iron laws of history will require every nation to tranverse the same predestined path to the same predestined conclusion. Given this faith to a monolithic world, it regards the very existence of diversity as a threat to the communist future.

I do not assert that communism must always remain a messianic faith. Like other fanaticisms of the past, it may in time lose its crusading fervor, abandon its sense of infallibility and accept the diversity of human destiny. Already in countries like Yugoslavia and Poland we see communism subsiding into a local and limited ideology. Some have discerned the same evolution in the Soviet Union itself; and we may all earnestly hope that Chairman Khrushchev and his associates will renounce the dream of
making

making the world over in the image of the Soviet Union. It must be the purpose of other nations to do what they can to hasten that day.

But that day has not yet arrived. The conflict between absolutist and pluralistic conceptions of the destiny of mankind remains the basic source of discord within the United Nations. It has given rise to what is known as the Cold War. If it were not for this conflict, this Organization would have been able to make steady progress toward achieving the world of choice and justice envisaged at San Francisco. Because of the Soviet rejection of an open world, mankind's hope for progress and for peace have been systematically thwarted and defeated.

V

The process began even before the nations gathered at San Francisco. As soon as German defeat appeared certain, the Soviet Union began to feel free to abandon the policy of war-time cooperation to which it had turned for self-protection. In early 1945, Moscow instructed the communist parties of the West to purge themselves of the sin of cooperation, and to return to the pre-war communist view that democratic governments were imperialistic and wicked. Within a few weeks after the meeting at Yalta, the Soviet Union took swift action in Rumania and Poland in brutal violation of the Yalta pledges of political freedom.

At the same time, it unleashed a savage political offensive against the United States, charging that the American government — the government of Franklin Roosevelt — was engaged in separate peace negotiations with Hitler. Roosevelt replied to Stalin that he deeply resented these "vile misrepresentations." At the end of March, 1945, Roosevelt cabled Winston

Churchill

Churchill that he was "watching with anxiety and concern the development of the Soviet attitude" and that he was "acutely aware of the dangers inherent in the present course of events, not only for the immediate issue but also the San Francisco Conference and future world cooperation." An hour before his tragic death, Roosevelt sent a final cable to Churchill: "We must be firm ... our course thus far is correct."

It is important to recall these facts, because the Soviet Union has tried in the years since to pretend that its policy of aggression was a defensive response to the ^{change} ~~change~~ of administration in the United States, or to Churchill's 1946 speech at Fulton, Missouri, or to some other event after the death of Roosevelt. But the historical record is clear. As soon as the Soviet government saw no further military need for the war-time coalition, it set out to achieve its expansionist purposes.

The ink was hardly dry on the Charter before the leaders of the Soviet Union began their war against the world of the United Nations. The very first meeting of the Security Council was called to hear a complaint by Iran that Soviet troops had failed to withdraw from the northern part of that country on the date on which they had agreed to leave. Not only had they declined to go; they had installed a puppet regime on Iranian soil and had blocked Iranian troops from entering their own territory. The Soviet Union, in short, was violating the territorial integrity and denying the political independence of Iran — and doing so by armed force. Eventually the United Nations forced a reluctant agreement from the Soviet Union to live up to their pledge.

This was only the beginning. At the time of the German surrender, the Red Army was in occupation of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, ~~East~~

eastern

eastern Germany and most of Czechoslovakia. And there the Red Army stayed. It stayed in violation of the agreement reached at Yalta among the heads of the allied powers -- the agreement which pledged the independence and promised free elections to these nations. By 1948, five nations and half of a sixth, with a combined population of more than 90 million people, had been absorbed into the communist world. The Soviet Union has never dared test this decision by permitting the peoples of eastern Europe to express their preferences in a free vote.

Before the suppression of eastern Europe was complete, the Soviet Union was threatening Greece and Turkey -- fomenting guerrilla warfare -- assailing neighboring regimes through all the instrumentalities of propaganda and subversion. The United Nations fact-finding mission, sent to Greece in 1948, clearly documented the outside communist support provided for the insurrection in Greece.

Nor were such activities confined to Europe. In Malaya -- in the Philippines -- in Burma -- in Indo-China the communists encouraged and supported guerrilla uprisings against constituted governments.

In one event after another on one stage after another -- the rejection in the United Nations of the American plan for the internationalization of atomic energy, the rejection of the Marshall Plan, the blockade of Berlin and, finally, the invasion of South Korea -- the Soviet Union displayed its determination to assail political independence, resist the world of the Charter and impose its vision of a communist future.

Let me recall to this Council, Mr. President, the record of the Soviet Union with regard to international agreements.

The Soviet

The Soviet government has signed treaties of non-aggression, as it did with the Baltic states and Finland — and then systematically invaded the countries whose integrity it had solemnly promised to respect.

At Yalta and in a succession of peace treaties, it gave its assurance that human rights and fundamental freedoms would be respected in the countries of Eastern Europe — and then abolished those rights and freedoms.

In 1945 it signed a thirty-year pact of mutual assistance and non-aggression with China, pledging that its support would "go exclusively to the National Government as the Central Government of China" — and violated that treaty before the negotiators^{had} returned to China.

At Potsdam it promised democratic rights for all German citizens — and within its own zone ran roughshod over these rights. At Geneva in 1954 it agreed not to introduce arms into Vietnam — and shortly sent guns and ammunition to the Viet Minh.

It denounced nuclear testing — and then violated the moratorium which for three years had spared the world the danger of nuclear tests. Within this Council, it has thwarted the majority will 100 times by the use of the veto. The record shows that, whenever the Soviet Union finds it to its advantage to do so, it never scruples to break any treaty, reject any agreement or disregard any pledge.

VI

With the death of Stalin in 1953, the world had a resurgence of hope. No one can question that Chairman Khrushchev has altered many things in the Soviet Union. He has introduced welcome measures of normalization in many sectors of Soviet life. He has abandoned — on paper, at least — the

Leninist

Leninist thesis about the desirability of war as the means of achieving a communist world. He has recognized — intermittently, at least — the appalling dangers of nuclear weapons.

But there is one thing he has not altered — and that is the basic drive to abolish the world of the Charter, to destroy the hope of a pluralistic world order. He has not altered the basic drive to fulfill the prophecies of Marx and Lenin and make all the world communist. And he has demonstrated his singleness of purpose in a succession of aggressive acts — the suppression of the East German uprisings in 1953 and the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, in the series of manufactured crises and truculent deadlines over Berlin, in the resumption of nuclear testing, in the explosion — defying a resolution of the General Assembly — of a hundred megaton bomb, in the continued stimulation of guerrilla and subversive warfare all over the globe, in the insistent and compulsive intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, whether by diplomatic assaults, by economic pressures, by mobs and riots, by propaganda or by espionage.

The world welcomes the movement toward a more normal life within the Soviet Union — for the process known as "de-Stalinization." But the world has not yet seen a comparable de-Stalinization of Soviet foreign policy.

VII

It is this which has shadowed the world since the end of the second World war — which has dimmed our hopes of peace and progress, which has forced those nations determined to defend their freedom to take necessary measures in their own self-defense. In this effort, the leadership has inevitably fallen to a considerable degree to the United States. I do not

believe

believe that every action we have taken in the effort to strengthen the independence of nations has necessarily been correct; I do not subscribe to the thesis of national infallibility for any nation. But I do take great pride in the role we have performed.

Our response to Soviet expansionism has taken many forms. We have sought loyally to support the United Nations, to be faithful to the world of the Charter, and to build an operating system that acts, and does not only talk for peace.

We have never refused to negotiate. We have sat at conference after conference seeking peaceful solutions to menacing conflicts.

We have worked hard for general and complete disarmament under international supervision. We have tried to win agreement on a treaty which would end all nuclear testing.

We have declined to be provoked into actions which might lead to war — in face of such challenges as the Berlin blockade and such affronts to humanity as the repression of the Hungarian revolt and the erection of the Berlin wall.

We have assisted nations, both our allies and unaligned states, who have shown a will to maintain their national independence. To shield their independence, and our own, we have rebuilt our armed forces — established a network of defensive alliances — and reluctantly devote so ~~large~~ great a share of our resources to national defense.

Some people seem to believe that the Cold War is a private struggle between two great superpowers. They could not be more wrong. It is a world civil war — a contest between the pluralistic world and the monolithic world — a contest between the world of the Charter and the

world of communism. Every nation has a stake in the outcome of this contest.

We all recognized this in 1950, when the communists decided to test how far they could get by direct military action and unleashed the invasion of South Korea. The response of the United Nations to this act of aggression taught the communists that overt aggression would produce, not appeasement, but resistance. This remains the essential lesson. The United Nations stood firm in Korea because we knew the consequences of appeasement.

The policy of appeasement is always intended to strengthen the moderates in the country appeased; but its effect is always to strengthen the extremists. We are prepared to meet every legitimate Soviet concern more than halfway; but we have only contempt for blackmail. We know that every retreat before intimidation strengthens those in the Soviet Union who say that the threat of force can always achieve communist objectives -- and undermines those in the Soviet Union who are urging caution and restraint.

Nations must do what they can to hasten the day when the Soviet leadership abandons its sense of absolutism and accepts the diversity of human destiny. The best way to achieve this -- the only way to reinforce those within the Soviet Union arguing for moderation and peace -- is to make it absolutely clear that aggression will be met with resistance and force with force.

Mr. President, the time has come for this Council to decide whether to make a serious attempt to bring peace to ^{the} world -- or to let the United Nations stand idly by while the Soviet Union continues a course of piecemeal aggression, hoping that no single issue will seem consequential enough to

mobilize

mobilize the resistance of the free peoples. For my own government, this question is not in doubt. We remain committed to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and we intend to defend them.

VIII

We are engaged today in a crucial test of those principles. Nearly four years ago a revolution took place on the island of Cuba. This revolution overthrew a hated dictatorship in the name of democratic freedom and social progress. Dr. Castro made explicit promises to the people of Cuba. He promised them the restoration of the 1940 constitution abandoned by the Batista dictatorship; a "provisional government of entirely civilian character that will return the country to normality and hold general elections within a period of no more than one year;" "truly honest" elections along with "full and untrammelled" freedom of information and political activity.

That is what Dr. Castro offered the people of Cuba. That is what the people of Cuba accepted — and the whole hemisphere rejoiced. When Dr. Castro came to the United States in the spring of 1959, he was widely hailed as Cuba's liberator. A conservative administration in Washington offered immediate diplomatic recognition and stood ready to provide the revolutionary regime with economic assistance.

But a grim but quiet struggle was taking place within the revolutionary regime between its democratic and its communist wings — between those who overthrew Batista to bring freedom to Cuba, and those who overthrew Batista to bring Cuba to the communist bloc. In a few months the struggle was substantially over. Brave men who had fought with Castro in the Sierra Maestra and who had organized the underground against Batista in the cities were assailed,

were assailed, arrested, and driven from office into prison or exile, all for the single offense of anti-communism, all for the single offense of believing in the principle of the Cuban revolution. By the end of 1959, the communist party was the only party in Cuba permitted freedom of political action. By early 1960 the Castro regime was entering into intimate economic and political relations with the Soviet Union.

The American government reacted with forbearance. All these events took place months before the Cuban sugar quota was cancelled in the summer of 1960 — and many more months before Cuban exactions upon our Embassy in Havana forced the suspension of diplomatic relations in December 1960.

As the communization of Cuba proceeded, more and more democratic Cubans, men who had fought for freedom in the Cuban hills, were forced into exile. Such men were eager to return to their homeland and to rescue their revolution from its corruption by communism.

In the spring of 1961, these exiles made a valiant attempt to liberate their country, under the political sponsorship of Dr. Miro Cardona, Dr. Castro's first prime minister, and of the Cuban revolutionary Council, composed without exception of men who had opposed Batista and backed the Revolution. The United States Government sympathized with these men — as throughout our history Americans have always sympathized with those who sought to liberate their native lands from despotism and dictatorship. I have no apologies to make for that sympathy, or for the assistance which these brave Cuban democrats received from our hands. But I would point out too that my Government, still forbearing, refrained from direct intervention. It sent no American troops to Cuba. It withheld the strong

arm of that military might which was readily at hand.

In the year and a half since, Dr. Castro has completed the communization of his unfortunate country. The 1940 constitution was never restored. Elections were never held and their promise withdrawn — though Dr. Castro's twelve months have stretched to forty-two. The Castro regime has fastened on Cuba an iron system of repression. It has eradicated human and civil rights. It has openly transformed Cuba into a communist satellite. Whatever benefit this regime might have brought to Cuba has long since been cancelled out by the firing squads, the drumhead executions, the hunger and misery, the suppression of civil and political and cultural freedom.

IX

Yet even these violations of human rights, repellent as they are — even this dictatorship, cruel as it may be — would not, if kept within the confines of one country, constitute a direct threat to the peace and independence of other states. The threat lies in the submission of the Castro regime to the will of the Soviet Union. It lies in its readiness to act as Soviet agent in trying to break up the relations of confidence and cooperation among the good neighbors of this hemisphere — at a time, by the Alliance for Progress, that best effort to raise living standards for all the peoples of the Americas has given new vitality and hope to the inter-American system.

Let me make it absolutely clear what the issue of Cuba is. It is not an issue of revolution. This hemisphere has seen many revolutions, including the one which gave my own nation its independence.

It is not an issue of reform. My nation has lived happily

with other countries which have had thorough-going and fundamental social transformations like Mexico and Bolivia. The whole point of the Alliance for Progress is to bring about a peaceful and democratic revolution in the Americas.

It is not an issue of socialism. As Secretary of State Rusk said at Punta del Este in February, our hemisphere has room for a variety of economic and political systems (chk quote).

It is not an issue of dictatorship. As much as the American republics condemn dictatorship, they have lived with dictators before. If this were his only fault, they could even live with Dr. Castro.

The central objection of the democratic states of the Americas to the Castro regime is not because it is revolutionary, not because it is socialistic, not because it is dictatorial, not even because Dr. Castro perverted a noble revolution in the interests of a squalid totalitarianism. It is because he has done so in the interests of a totalitarian invasion of this hemisphere -- and an invasion at just the time when the hemisphere is making a new and unprecedented effort at democratic progress.

The crucial fact is that the Castro regime has given the Soviet Union a bridgehead and staging area in this hemisphere -- that it has invited an extra-continental, anti-democratic and expansionist power into the bosom of the American family -- that it has made itself an accomplice of the Soviet Union in the communist enterprise of world dominion.

Some say that, if the government of Cuba invited the assistance of the Soviet Union, this act legitimatizes the whole process of Soviet intervention. Some seek to equate the presence of Soviet bases in Cuba with the presence of American bases in parts of the world near the Soviet Union.

This contention misses the point.

The whole point is, the purpose for which assistance is given or bases established. Assistance to help a country defend its independence -- assistance which leaves the political institutions of the recipient country intact -- assistance which does not threaten the territorial integrity or political independence of other states -- these forms of assistance are entirely consistent with the principles of the United Nations and with the world of the Charter. But assistance which introduces a nuclear threat into an area now free of it-- assistance which threatens the integrity and independence of neighboring states -- assistance which is designed to

replace the world of the Charter by a monolithic world -- this form of assistance is radically different. This form of assistance is directed at the very principles which underlie the United Nations.

There is another significant difference between this assistance and the assistance which has marked the Cold War in other parts of the world. For one hundred and fifty years the nations of the Americas have painfully labored to construct a hemisphere of independent and cooperating nations -- free from the presence of foreign threats. An international system far older than this one -- the Inter-American system -- has been erected on this principle. And more than once my own country has summoned men to arms in its defense. The principle of the territorial integrity of the Western hemisphere has been woven into the history, the life and the thought of all the people of the Americas. In striking at that principle the Soviet Union is striking at the strongest and most enduring strain in the fabric of American foreign policy. It is disrupting the convictions and aspirations of a century and a half. It is intruding on the firm policies of twenty nations. To allow this challenge to go unanswered would be to allow the Soviet Union to undermine a basic and historic pillar of American security.

Twenty year

XI

Twenty years ago the nations of the Americas were understandably disturbed by the threat of Nazism. Just as they would have reacted with vigor had any American republic given itself over to the doctrines and agents of Nazism, so today they look on the conquest of Cuba by communism with equal concern. They do not intend to applaud and assist while Dr. Castro and his Soviet friends try to halt the march of free and progressive democracy in Latin America.

Yet despite the ominous movement of affairs in Cuba, the reaction of the hemisphere, and of my own Government, to the communization of Cuba continued to be marked by forbearance. Despite Dr. Castro's verbal assaults on other nations in the hemisphere, despite his campaign of subversion against their governments, despite the insurrectionary expeditions actually launched from Cuba, the nations of the Americas retained their hope that the Cuban Revolution would free itself from the illusions and dogmas of communism. But Dr. Castro's persistence in his campaigns against the democratic governments of this hemisphere -- his determination to become the junior partner of Moscow -- finally began to prevail.

If Cuba has withdrawn from the American family of nations, it has been Dr. Castro's own act. If Cuba is today isolated from its brethren of the Americas, it is self-inflicted isolation. If the present Cuban government has turned its back on its own history, tradition, religion and culture, if it has chosen to cast its lot with the communist empire, it must accept the consequences of its decision. The Cuban Government methodically and systematically severed the links of amity and confidence between the people of Cuba and their brethren in the Hemisphere. The

Hemisphere had no alternative, so long as this regime rules in Havana, but to accept the tragic choice Dr. Castro and his Soviet mentors have imposed on his people -- that is, to accept Cuba's self-exclusion from the Hemisphere.

One after another, the other governments of this hemisphere have withdrawn their diplomatic representatives from Cuba. Today only three (?) Latin American states still have their ambassadors in Havana. Last February at Punta del Este, the American states unanimously declared that the Castro regime was incompatible with the principles on which the Organization of American States had been founded and, by a two-thirds vote, excluded Cuba from the OAS.

XII

All this took place before Soviet arms and technicians began to move into Cuba in massive, continuous shipments. But, even then, the governments of the hemisphere were willing to withhold final judgment -- so long as the Soviet weapons were defensive, we were prepared to let Dr. Castro have them. Any my Government -- and the United Nations -- were solemnly assured by the representatives of both Soviet Russia and Cuba that these were purely defensive weapons.

On September 12, the Soviet Government said in an official statement: "The armaments and military equipment sent to Cuba are designed exclusively for defensive purposes." The Soviet Government added that Soviet rockets were so powerful that "there is no need to search for sites for them beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union." And last

week, on October 18, Mr. Gromyko the Soviet Foreign Minister, told the President of the United States at the White House that Soviet assistance to Cuba "pursued solely the purpose of contributing to the defense capabilities of Cuba," that "training by Soviet specialists of Cuban nationals in handling defensive armaments was by no means offensive," and that "if it were otherwise, the Soviet Government would have never become involved in rendering such assistance."

Mr. President, we now know the truth. We now know that, while the Soviet Government was engaged in this fantastic exercise in deception, the weapons it was sending x into Cuba -- the launching pads its technicians were installing -- the missiles unloaded from Soviet ships -- were not all for defense. When the Soviet Union sends more than 10,000 (?) military technicians to its satellite in the Western hemisphere -- when it sends bombers capable of delivering nuclear weapons -- when it installs in Cuba thirty-two missiles with atomic warheads, each having a range of 1,000 nautical miles -- when it prepares sites for additional missilese with a range of 1,500 miles -- when it does these things under the cloak of secrecy -- when its actions are in flagrant violation of the policies of the Organization of American States and of the Charter of the United Nations -- this clearly is a threat to this Hemisphere and to the world.

We now know that the Soviet Union, not content with Dr. Castro's oath of fealty to Marxism - Leninism, not content with the destruction

of Cuban independence, not content with the extension of Soviet power into the western hemisphere, not content with a fundamental challenge to the Monroe Doctrine and the Inter-American system and the United Nations Charter, not content with the provision of dangerous weapons to Cuba, has decided to transform Cuba into a base for communist aggression -- into a means of putting the United States and others under the nuclear gun, intensifying the Soviet diplomacy of blackmail in every part of the world and upsetting the balance of force which has precariously secured world peace.

In our passion for peace, we perhaps have forbore too much. But there must be limits to forbearance, if forbearance is not to become the diagram for defeat. Dr. Castro transformed Cuba into a totalitarian dictatorship with impunity -- he extinguished the rights of political freedom with impunity -- he aligned himself with the Soviet bloc with impunity -- he solicited defensive weapons from the Soviet Union with impunity -- he may welcome thousands of communists into Cuba with impunity -- but, when, with cold deliberation, he turns his country over to the Soviet Union for the purpose of erecting bases for long-range missiles and thus carries the Soviet program for aggression into the heart of the Americas the day of forbearance is past.

XIII

If the United States and the other nations of the western hemisphere should accept this new phase of aggression, we would be delinquent in our obligations to world peace. If the United States and the other nations of the western hemisphere should accept this basic disturbance

of the world's structure of power, we would invite a new surge of communist aggression at every point along the frontier which divides the communist world from the democratic world. If we do not stand firm here, we allow our adversaries to think that we will stand firm nowhere -- and we guarantee a heightening of the world civil war to new levels of intensity and danger.

We hope that Chairman Khrushchev has not made a miscalculation characteristic of dictators: that he has not mistaken forbearance for weakness. It would be a strange miscalculation for him to make when the computation of comparative strength shows that the balance of military power is vastly on the side of the democracies -- that the United States has the effective strength, poised for delivery, to blast these long-range missiles bases out of the ground. We cannot believe that he has deluded himself, as Hitler did before him, into supposing that though democracy had power, it lacked nerve; that, though it had weapons, it was without the will to use them.

We still hope that the worst may be avoided -- that the Soviet leadership can be induced to return to its senses -- that it will call an end to this mad and ominous adventure. Accordingly, the President has directed the United States Navy to quarantine Cuba against further imports of military equipment.¹ This quarantine, as the President explained last night, is authorized by the inherent right of self-defense. But the Soviet presence in Cuba is a threat to the entire inter-American system. So last night the President called for an immediate meeting of the Organ of Consultation of the Organization of the American States,

to consider this threat to hemispheric security and to invoke Article 6 and 8 of the Rio Treaty in support of all necessary action.

The President has further directed the increased surveillance of Cuba and of its military build-up. Should offensive military preparations intensify the threat to peace in the Western hemisphere, he has directed the armed forces of the United States to hold themselves in readiness for any eventuality. Should any nuclear missile be launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western hemisphere, my Government will regard it as an attack by the Soviet Union against the United States, requiring full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I am submitting today a resolution to the Security Council designed to find a way out of this calamitous situation.

This resolution calls, as an interim measure under Article 40 of the Charter, for the immediate dismantling and withdrawal from Cuba of all missiles and other offensive weapons.

It further authorizes and requests the Acting Secretary General to despatch to Cuba a United Nations observer corps to assure and report on compliance with this resolution.

Upon UN certification of compliance, it calls for the termination of the measures of quarantine directed against military shipments to Cuba.

And, in conclusion, it urgently recommends that the United States of America and the Soviet Union confer promptly on measures to remove the existing threat to the security of the western hemisphere and the peace of the world and to report thereon to the Security Council.

Mr. President, the issue which confronts us today is grave. I do not think that, since the end of the Second World War, there has been so profound a threat to humanity's version of peace -- so fateful a challenge to the world of the Charter. The hopes of mankind are concentrated in this room. The action we take may determine the future of civilization on this planet. I know that this Council will approach the issue with a full sense of our responsibility and a solemn understanding of the import of our deliberations.

There is a road toward peace. The beginning of that road, I deeply believe, is marked out in the resolution which I have submitted for your consideration. If we act affirmatively upon this resolution, we will give mankind new hope -- we will give humanity one more chance to take up again the dreadful questions of nuclear arms and military bases and the means and causes of aggression and war -- to take them up and do something practical about them.

Let it be remembered, not as the day when the world came to the edge of nuclear war, but as the day when men stared for a moment into the abyss and resolved to let nothing thereafter stop them in their quest for peace.

* * * * *

This is a solemn and significant day in the life of the United Nations, and the hope of world community which it embodies.